

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Application

Claims 1-7 and 9-24 are pending in the present application. Following entry of the amendment, new claims 25-32 will have been added.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 and 9-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,890,166 to Eisenberg et al. (hereinafter "Eisenberg") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,930 to Parker et al. (hereinafter "Parker"). The Examiner has rejected claims 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e) as being unpatentable over Eisenberg in view of Parker and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,917,492 to Bereiter et al. (hereinafter "Bereiter"). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 and 9-24 are allowable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

New claims 25-31 are supported by the specification as originally filed, and thus do not constitute new matter. In particular, the subject matter recited in claims 25-32 is supported by various portions of the specification, including page 12, line 22 through page 13, line 6.

The disclosure has been objected to due to informalities. These informalities have been addressed through an amendment to the specification.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 9 and Dependent Claims 2-7 and 10-15

Claims 1 and 9 have been rejected as being anticipated by Eisenberg in view of Parker. As noted by the examiner, Eisenberg does not teach the step of saving a previous version of project data, wherein the previous version contains a value of project data attribute(s) prior to the update. However, Applicants contend that, contrary to the Examiner's contention, Parker does not teach the step of saving a previous version of the project data. Examiner cites to Parker at column 4, lines 38-40, however, all that that describes is the generation of a new signature and an update to two databases. This corresponds to steps 1.2.06, 1.2.07, and 1.2.08 shown in Parker Fig. 2, however, there is no further discussion in Parker of these steps. No teaching or suggestion is made in Parker that a previous version containing a value of a project data attribute prior to update is stored. No

definition or explanation of the contents of the Change Set database or the Inventory database is provided in Parker.

Additionally, there is no motivation to combine the database management system of Eisenberg with the inventory management system of Parker. While the Examiner discusses the motivation is found in Eisenberg at column 5, lines 23-27, that section of Eisenberg discusses the "commit scope." Again, Applicants contend that the glossary of terms section in Eisenberg may be useful to elucidate the other sections of Eisenberg, the glossary does not serve on its own to provide coherent teachings or motivations.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention, as recited in Claims 1 and 9, patentably defines over Eisenberg in view of Parker. Reconsideration of the Section 103(e) rejection of Claims 1 and 9 is respectfully requested.

Because elements of claims 1 and 9 are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art, their dependent claims 2-7 and 10-15 are also distinguished from and not anticipated by Eisenberg in view of Parker.

Rejection of Claim 16 and Dependent Claims 17-18

Claim 16 and its dependent claims 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Eisenberg in view of Parker.

Claim 16 includes the limitation of a project database operative to store a new version of project data upon receipt of an update to the project data element.

To the extent that projects exist in Eisenberg, a project is represented by a variant domain which is a hierarchy of parts. (Eisenberg, column 29, lines 22-25 and 37-41). In Eisenberg, versions of variant domains are not stored. Only versions of parts (which may constitute variant domains) are seen. Part revisions are discussed at column 15, lines 4 through column 16, line 56 of Eisenberg.

Eisenberg describes a database management system that stores versions of parts of one or more databases. It also stores information about which parts are used together and which parts are promoted together. (Eisenberg, column 1, line 16 – column 3, line 3).

Project data in the claimed invention is "data that is used to define and describe" an issue related to a project, such as a software defect, a task, a development milestone, or any

other discrete issue that a user wishes to track related to a project. (Specification at pages 8-9).

This type of project data is not discussed in Eisenberg, let alone related to the “part” concept. Versioning of project data, including at least one project data attribute, is not taught in Eisenberg.

Claim 16 includes the feature of a project tracking system operative to maintain versions of project data comprising at least one project data element. As discussed above, the Eisenberg invention does not maintain versions of project data, but rather maintains versions of “parts.” Parker similarly does not disclose such versions of project data. Thus, elements of claims 16 are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art, and claim 16 and dependent claims 17 and 18 are distinguished from and not anticipated by Eisenberg in view of Parker.

Rejection of Claim 19 and Dependent Claims 20-24

The Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable by Eisenberg in view of Parker, and claims 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable by Eisenberg in view of Parker further in view of Bereiter. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 19-24 are patentable over the art of record because claims 19 recites features that are not disclosed or suggested either explicitly or inherently by the combination of Eisenberg in view of Parker, as set forth below, and claims 20-24 are patentable over the art of record because they recite features that are not disclosed or suggested either explicitly or inherently by the combination of Eisenberg in view of Parker further in view of Bereiter.

Claims 19-24 include features neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely “reading a selected property value for the selected version” and “reading a second property value for at least one other version of project data.”

As discussed above, reading of versions of project data is not found in Eisenberg or in Parker. Nor are they found in Bereiter.

Additionally, as previously stated, in Claim 19 and its dependent claim includes “a selected version of the project data” and “a selected property value for the selected version”. Only one selection is made in Eisenberg – the selection of a revision. Claim 19 also includes the limitation “comparing the selected property value to the second property value.” As no

property value is selected in Eisenberg, this comparison can not be seen in that reference. The Examiner cites to Parker for these limitations. However, the Examiner cites to both the description of Fig. 2 of Parker and of Fig. 3 of Parker. Figure 2 discusses inventorying (Parker, column 4, lines 13-17) and Figure 3 discusses processing changed files. There is no suggestion that steps from the two different processes should be combined.

Additionally, there are no teachings in Parker that there are versions or a selected version of data, that property values are read for a selected version, or that property values are compared. Nor is such a teaching found in Bereiter.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is patentably distinct and allowable over Eisenberg in view of Parker, and that claims 20 through 24 are patentably distinct and allowable over Eisenberg in view of Parker further in view of Bereiter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections of claims 19-24.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance based on, inter alia, arguments patentably distinguishing them over the cited art. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Date: May 20, 2004



Sharon Fenick
Registration No. 45,269

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439